UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/735,482	12/12/2003	Georg Neumann	021756-003500US	2477

51206   7590   10/04/2007
TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW LLP
TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER
8TH FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3834

EXAMINER
MITCHELL, JASON D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2193	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
10/04/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/735,482	NEUMANN ET AL.
	Examiner	**Art Unit**	
	Jason Mitchell	2193	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>25 July 2007</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1 and 4-50* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1 and 4-50* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>7/25/07</u>.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claims 1, and 4-50 are pending in this application.

Response to Amendment

2.   Initially, the Examiner notes that claim 1 is identified as "(Original)" but also

indicates an amendment to the claim. For the purposes of this action the amendment

will be examined.

Response to Arguments

3.   **Applicant's arguments have been considered but are moot in view of the**

new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4.   The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly
> claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5.   **Claims 1 and 4-45 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as**

being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject

matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1 recites, "replaying an event" but does not recite a corresponding initial

playing of an event. Accordingly one of ordinary skill in the art would not have

recognized what event is being *re*played. Claims 36, 38, 39, and 44-45 make similar

recitations and are also rejected. Further claims dependent on claims 1, 36, 38-39 and

44-45 incorporate this limitation and do not correct the issue and thus are also rejected.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

7.   **Claims 1, 4-12, 20-27, 36, 38-42 and 44-45 are rejected under 35**

U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by "Java ™ 2 Platform, Standard Edition, v1.2.2

API Specification" (Java SE).

Regarding Claims 1, 36,38-39, and 44-45: Java SE discloses:

determining a cursor position (Interface AccessibleComponent, pg. 1,

getAccessibleAt(Point p)");

ascertaining, based on the cursor position, an accessibility context associated

with the cursor position (Interface AccessibleComponent, pg. 1, getAccessibleAt(Point

p)";

identifying a component by reference to the accessibility context (Class

AccessibleContext pg. 3 "getAccessibleComponent()"), wherein the accessibility context

has an accessibility role (Class AccessibleContext pg. 3 "getAccessibleRole()") that

defines a set of properties, including at least one program method, associated with the

accessibility context (Class AccessibleContext pg. 3 "getAccessibleAction()"), wherein

the identified component comprises the set of properties (e.g. Interface

AccessibleComponent pg. 2 "getFont ()"; "setFont()");

searching a component hierarchy for an object having an accessibility context

matching the component's accessibility context (Class AccessibleContext pg. 3

"getAccessibleComponent()"); and

replaying an event by calling a program method defined by an accessibility role

for the object (Interface AccessibleAction pg. 1 "doAccessibleAction(int I)").

8.   **Regarding Claim 4:** Java SE discloses the object comprises the set of

properties, including the at lest one program method, defined by the accessibility role

(e.g. Interface AccessibleComponent pp 1-3, Method Summary).

9.   **Regarding Claims 5-12, 40-42:** Java SE discloses responding to the claimed

triggering events (e.g. Class Event and Class EventListener). Further in regard to claims

7 and 12, Java SE discloses executing program method a first or second time (Interface

AccessibleAction pg. 1 "doAccessibleAction(int I)").

10.   **Regarding Claims 20-26:** The claims recite various known GUI elements that

Java SE discloses as implementable as AccessableComponents (Interface

AccessibleComponent pg. 1, "any object that is rendered on the screen").

11.   **Regarding Claim 27:** Java SE disclose the action of formatting a portion of text

(Interface AccessibleComponent, pg. 2 "setFont()")

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

12.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

13.   **Claims 13-18, 28-35, 37, 43 and 46-50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as**

being unpatentable over "Java ™ 2 Platform, Standard Edition v1.2.2 API

Specification" Java SE in view of "Specification-based Testing for GUI-based

Applications" by Chen et al. (Chen).

14.   **Regarding Claim 13-18 and 37:** The claims recite recording and subsequently

modifying records. Java SE does not explicitly disclose this.

15.   Chen teaches recording GUI actions and modifying the created records (pg. 207,

Section 2 "a Capture/Replay tool is used to record all the interesting events ... edit the

recorded test script").

16.   It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to use the 'Capture/Replay' testing methodology taught by Chen

with the accessibility tools disclosed in Java SE in order to provide an environment to

test accessible, GUI-based applications (Chen Abstract "how to automate effective

testing for applications with complicated graphical user interactions.").

17.   **Regarding Claims 28-30:** The claims recite iterating over the steps of claim 1.

Chen teaches applying the "Capture/Replay" tool to all actions (pg. 207, Section 2 "a

Capture/Replay tool is used to record all the interesting events").

18.   It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to perform the steps of claim 1 iteratively in so as to "to record all

the interesting events" (Chen pg. 207, Section 2).

19.   **Regarding Claims 31-35, 43:** The claims recite standard testing and analysis

functionality as taught by Chen. Further, regarding claim 35, it would have been obvious

to test the application for accessibility as claimed (Java SE Interface

AccessibleComponent "determine if an object supports the AccessibleComponent

interface")

20.   **Regarding Claim 46:** The claim recites the limitations of claim 1 except wherein

the 'replaying' is analyzing the applications accessibility. This limitation has been

addressed in the rejection of claim 35.

21.   **Regarding Claim 47:** See the rejection of claim 12.

22.   **Regarding Claims 48-50:** See the rejection of claims 31-35.

23.   **Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over**

"Java tm 2 Platform, Standard Edition v1.2.2 API Specification" Java SE in view of

"Specification-based Testing for GUI-based Applications" by Chen et al. (Chen)

and further in view of Official Notice.

24.   **Regarding Claim 19:** The Java SE-Chen combination does not explicitly

disclose storing the records in an XML file.

25.   Official Notice is taken that XML was widely known and used at the time of the

invention, and it would have been obvious to use XML to store the records because it

would have provided a system independent method of storing the data.

Conclusion

26.   In view of the new grounds of rejection **THIS ACTION IS MADE NON-FINAL**.

27.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to

applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Jason Mitchell whose telephone number is (571) 272-

3728. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday and alternate Fridays 7:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Meng-Ai An can be reached on (571) 272-3756. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Jason Mitchell/
Jason Mitchell
9/28/07

MENG-AI T. AN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100